Minutes of Data Governance Committee Meeting

September 16, 2022

The members of the Data Governance Committee met via teleconference on Friday, September 16, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. The meeting was available to all members via livestream. The meeting was held pursuant to Miss. Code Annotated Section 25-41-5.

Members were present via teleconference. The following were present, and locations were recorded: Jo Ann Malone (MSDB – Jackson, MS), Armerita Tell (CTE, MSDB – Jackson, MS), Jill Dent, Judy Nelson (MSDB), Scott Clements (Greymont), Kristen Wynn (MSDB), Lea Johnson (MSDB), Donna Hales (MSDB), Brian McGairty (Woolfolk Bldg – Jackson, MS), Letitia Johnson (Madison, MS), Sonja Robertson (MSDB), Tammy Crosetti (MSDB), Jackie Sampsell (MSDB), Cory Murphy (MSDB, Dorm 4), Sarita Donaldson (Jackson, MS), Wendy Clemons (Brandon, MS).

I. Deborah Donovan called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and attendance was recorded.
II. A quorum of the committee was present so the meeting could be conducted. Voting members were reminded to have their cameras turned on while voting.
III. Deborah Donovan asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. A motion was made by Cory Murphy and seconded by Brian McGairty. The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes for the June 10, 2022, meeting. (No further discussion.)
IV. Deborah Donovan asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. A motion was made by Jo Ann Malone and seconded by Jackie Sampsell. The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes for the July 14, 2022, meeting. (No further discussion.)
V. Deborah Donovan asked for a motion to approve the agenda for today's meeting. A motion was made by Armerita Tell and seconded Wendy Clemons. The committee voted unanimously to approve the agenda for today's meeting. (No further discussion.)
VI. There were two informational items on the agenda as follows:
     1. Update on Data Sharing Agreement Workgroup (Donna Hales) -
          a. The agreement for Boston University was amended to add some additional data elements; California State University (Northridge) extended another year; Harvard University extended 23 months; and PEER Agreement was executed for assessing funding for the ESA Scholarships granted by the Office of Special Education.
          b. Interagency Agreements – no new agreements.
     2. Update on Course Code Workgroup (Tammy Crosetti) - We have had training in June and August on the course codes request forms the districts will have to use to submit changes. The deadline is October 30, 2022, for 23-24 school year for a new course code. Some are already utilizing the form. They understand, some have pushed back and then they understand the purpose and reasoning behind the form. MSIS (Mississippi Student Information System) Coordinators have also been changed. It seems to be working out. Thanks to OTSS (Office of Technology and Strategic Services) folks. **Discussion**: (Deborah Donovan) Thank you, I know a lot of work went into that. We look forward to ways to continue helping.
     3. ESSER Updates (Judy Nelson) - We just resubmitted our final ESSER Year 2 annual performance report. We did the first submission by July 31. We had a second submission to correct any errors reported by USDOE. This was a big data reporting for

LEAs and SEAs. Some of the things we learned during this process, (the report was very intense) school districts had to report FTEs and how much was spent on different categories. The districts do not have these categories on purchase orders or requisitions. So, they had to go back and research those expenditures. We know as we roll out Year 3 of the annual performance report that we have to give districts extra time to report this information. We are looking at ESSER 1, 2, and ARP reporting. For Year 2, there was no ARP ESSER reporting. Just a few districts reported for ESSER 2, but all 146 LEAs had to report on ESSER 1.   For Year 3 reporting, the districts will have to report on all three ESSER grants. Another lesson learned (and OTSS has been working with us on this) is the Data Dictionary. Different words and different terminology; there were different interpretations about expended and this caused a big confusion at the very beginning of the data reporting. It is very important as we continue to roll out the data reporting components of ESSER that we clearly define the terms that are in the report. A lot of people got confused about mental health support, what was funded by ESSER, what was not, FTE, expended, liquidated, etc. I am grateful to OTSS for developing a Data Dictionary. Another lesson learned is our state auditors are looking at what we are reporting out. If there is any data being reported, then auditors are looking at the quality of the data being reported. Data integrity is very important. The LEAs are not the ones that get the funding from US DoE, it is MDE (Mississippi Department of Education). We are the data stewards; we are responsible for the data entered by the LEAs. So, we have to make sure that we have the documentation to support whatever data they are putting in because they did come and ask for some supporting data for the FTEs and also wanted us to show that we reported the data on time. You may want to take a screenshot showing the data was submitted because sometimes the email is not clear. (Comments from Deborah) Thank you for including those lessons learned. It sounds like that was a huge undertaking for your office. It is hard with these ESSER funds because unlike other areas where we may have a year or two in advance, we are learning as we go. I appreciate everyone's hard work on that.

4. TIMS 2.0 update (Elizabeth Simmons): So, in December the Mississippi Textbook Company, our textbook repository closed after 100 years and that was day one of my new job as textbook coordinator. We had to rewrite some laws to ensure we could have a regional textbook depository. So, in that we have procured a contract with Tennessee book company to not only be our depository, but they are also building a new TIMS 2.0. This system will be web-based and not JAVA or Oracle-based. All the districts we have spoken to in the past couple of weeks are super excited about that. They will not have to have a certain type of computer or have JAVA and can use any internet browser. The biggest change will be when they purchase textbooks from the depository, the order will automatically be uploaded into TIMS. So, that will cut down on a lot of time on the school textbook coordinator as well as when we go in to do audits, the records should be a whole lot cleaner because they are not waiting until the last minute, or they are not inputting their new textbooks. Along with that, it will track not only the print textbooks (which TIMS 1.0 does) but it will also track the digital licenses which districts have not been able to do that. It will also track purchased professional development from the textbook vendors. So, we'll have data with print, digital and PD which will be new and

will help us understand who has adopted high quality instructional materials across the state. The third part of that contract is the adoption system. In the past everything has pretty much been on paper and in person, but Tennessee book company is creating a digital review site for us which they already use in the state of Tennessee. So, it will allow transparent access not only for the MDE or for school districts but also for other stakeholders as parents and community members can see what other districts have adopted. Right now, we are meeting with Tennessee book company along with OTSS to ensure that we can move TIMS 1.0 data over using SharePoint so they can upload the data, get it cleaned up, and the districts will have a chance to double check to make sure the information is correct. We are hoping that the depository in TIMS 2.0 will be set up and ready to go in November and then we'll start training in December or January. (Lea Johnson) Elizabeth has done an amazing job managing all of this. (Deborah Donovan) Yes, building a new system is kind of tough. A lot of work is going on in the agency and is beneficial to the districts.

5. November meeting update: Deborah proposed a few dates and participants used the "raise hand" feature of MS Teams to show what dates work best. November 1 had about ten votes. November 7 had about seven votes. November 14 had nine votes. November 18 only had about four votes. November 30 had about twelve votes. November 29 had about seven votes. Deborah asked for a motion to have our next meeting on November 30. A motion was made by Wendy Clemons and seconded by Cory Murphy. The motion carried with no further discussion.

VII. Approval: Data Governance Poll
   1. (Deborah) We are going to schedule some meetings (bi-weekly) and asked for availability via the chat feature in MS Teams.

VIII. Deborah Donovan asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was made by Jo Ann Malone and seconded by Lea Johnson. (No further discussion.) The committee voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

Deborah Donovan
Deborah Donovan (Dec 7, 2022 07:39 CST)
Data Governance Committee Chair

12/7/2022
Date

Barbara Young (Nov 30, 2022 10:04 CST)
Data Governance Committee Secretary

11/30/2022
Date